

JAN 10 2008

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FELIX BLANCO CLAVIJO,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 07-72090

Agency No. A97-351-269

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted January 7, 2008**

Before: O'SCANNLAIN, SILVERMAN and GRABER, Circuit Judges.

This is a petition for review from the Board of Immigration Appeals'
("BIA") denial of a motion to reopen.

We have reviewed the response to the court's October 25, 2007 order to
show cause. We conclude summary disposition is appropriate because the

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not
precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without
oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

07-72090

questions raised by this petition for review are so insubstantial as not to require further argument. *See United States v. Hooton*, 693 F.2d 857, 858 (9th Cir. 1982) (per curiam) (stating standard). The regulations provide that “a party may file only one motion to reopen,” and that the motion “must be filed no later than 90 days after the date on which the final administrative decision was rendered in the proceeding sought to be reopened.” 8 C.F.R. § 1003.2(c)(2). The BIA did not abuse its discretion in denying petitioner’s second motion to reopen, filed more than three years after petitioner was ordered removed *in absentia*. *See Iturribarria v. INS*, 321 F.3d 889, 894 (9th Cir. 2003). Accordingly, this petition for review is denied.

All other pending motions are denied as moot.

The temporary stay of removal shall continue in effect until issuance of the mandate.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.